

25020B

REMARKS

This is in response to the outstanding Office Action, Paper No. 7, dated April 9, 2003, which rejected all remaining claims 1-6 and 27-37 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 96/28258 to Davies. Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful review of the instant application and request reconsideration based on the above amendments and remarks below.

As provided above, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitation that the powder coating is applied to an outer portion of said plurality of outer fibers in the form of a wet slurry. Support for this amendment is provided in the Specification as filed, including at page 7, line 12. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated nor made obvious by Davies, and is in fact taught away from by Davies. As noted throughout Davies, including at page 10, lines 10-16, Davis uses a dry powder coating technique, and therefore melts the coating to hold the coating on the sheath. During this melting, Davis describes that it forms a discontinuous covering, which provides low bulk and low bending rigidity. Conversely, Applicants' invention is aimed toward applying a wet slurry and drying the slurry to get a better coating. Davies further teaches away from the claimed invention at page 4, lines 3-13 and page 5 line 18-page 6, line 2, where he distinguishes his product, with the discontinuous layer formed by dry powder coating, from a product made using a wet powder coating process, as is Applicants' unmelted coating.

Applicants have also added new claims 38-39 to further distinguish from the prior art. No new matter is added, as support for these claims is found in the Specification as filed, including at page 6, lines 2-4 and page 12, lines 9-12, respectively. As noted above, Applicants provide a more uniform coating than Davies due to the wet process, and do not melt (or at most insubstantially melt) the coating, as the wet process instead dries the coating onto the fibers, which as noted above is taught away by Davies.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1, and therefore its dependent claims, has been overcome, and respectfully request

25020B

allowance of claims 1-6 and 27-37. Additionally, Applicants have added new claims 38 and 39, which are believed to be allowable as well.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1-6 and 27-39 at an early date is solicited. If any questions should arise with respect to the above Remarks, or if the Examiner has any comments or suggestions to place the claims in better condition for allowance, it is requested that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney at the number listed above.

Addendum

1. Polymer Powder Coated Roving For Making Structural Composite

FAX RECEIVED
AUG 11 2003
GROUP 1700